

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 172047

61

ORIGIN IO-14

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 CU-04 INR-10 NSAE-00 RSC-01 USIA-15

ADP-00 SS-15 AF-10 ARA-16 EA-11 EUR-25 NEA-10 OIC-04

L-03 NSC-10 /149 R

DRAFTED BY IO/UNESCO:JCHAAHR:RBALLEN;JU 8-28-73

EXT. 23619

APPROVED BY IO/RDMOREY

IO/SEC -WMSOUTHWORTH

IO/UN/COR - RBALLEN (DRAFT)

C/Y - JLINMAN(SUBSTANCE)

----- 087965

P 291952Z AUG 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY PARIS PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 172047

NESCO

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: AORG, OCON, UNESCO

SUBJECT: 93RD EXECUTIVE BOARD -- ITEM 5.2 (MEDIUM-TERM
OBJECTIVES)

REF: PARIS 22213

1. THE FOLLOWING CONSTITUTES THE DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS ON THE
QUESTIONS RAISED IN 93 EX/4 AND SHOULD BE USED DURING THE
GENEVA GROUP'S DISCUSSION OF THIS AGENDA ITEM. THE COMMENTS
ARE ALSO INTENDED TO SERVE AS THE POSITION PAPER ON THIS
ITEM FOR USE DURING THE 93RD BOARD, AND MAY BE SUBJECT TO
CHANGE DEPENDING UPON GG DISCUSSION AND FURTHER RECOMMEN-
DATIONS BY THE PERMREP.

2. QUESTION 1: AGREE WITH DG'S INTERPRETATION, BUT IT
SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD THAT SOME EXISTING POLICY DIRECTIVES
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 172047

OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE (GC) MAY WELL CHANGE AS NEW
PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES ARE ESTABLISHED.

3. QUESTION 2: THIS QUESTION APPEARS TO US TO BE DIRECTLY

LINKED TO QUESTIONS 13 AND 15 AND THE THREE SHOULD BE DISCUSSED TOGETHER. QUESTION 2 PROPOSES THAT THE DEFINITION OF A SET OF MAJOR PROBLEMS BE ABANDONED, YET THE DISCUSSION RELATING TO QUESTIONS 13 AND 15 REFERS SPECIFICALLY TO PROBLEMS. SOME INCONSISTENCY HERE, SINCE APPROACH SUGGESTED IN QUESTION 2 CANNOT BE ACCEPTED IF "PROBLEMS" ARE TO BE

THE STARTING POINT IN QUESTIONS 13 AND 15. WE HAVE NO OBJECTIONS TO QUESTION 13 AND SUPPORT LINEAR APPROACH OUTLINED IN QUESTION 15, BUT REITERATE THAT ONE CANNOT ELIMINATE PROBLEMS IN QUESTION 2 AND THEN REINTRODUCE THEM AS STARTING POINT IN QUESTIONS 13 AND 15.

4. QUESTION 3: ANSWER IS YES. THE DISCUSSION SECTION PROVIDES USEFUL COMMENTS ON SUCH FURTHER ELABORATION OF CRITERIA.

5. QUESTION 4: ANSWER IS YES, BUT PARA. 32 SEEMS IMPLY THAT SUCH ORDERING OF PRIORITIES WILL PROVIDE JUSTIFICATION FOR EVERYTHING UNESCO HAS BEEN DOING IN THESE SECTORS. THUS, WHILE PRIORITIES MAY WELL CONTINUE FOR EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, THERE CAN BE SHIFT WITHIN EACH OF THESE SECTORS AS NEW OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES ARE IDENTIFIED. EQUALLY, WHILE THERE MAY BE GRADUAL REINFORCEMENT OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT, THIS DOES NOT MEAN NECESSARILY BUDGET ADD-ONS BUT COULD ARISE FROM ELIMINATION OF LOWER PRIORITY ACTIVITIES IN EDUCATION AND SCIENCE.

6. QUESTION 5: ANSWER IS NEGATIVE. WE BELIEVE 18 C/4 SHOULD CONTAIN INTER-SECTORAL PRESENTATION OF DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION FOR REASONS WELL-KNOWN TO PERMDEL. WE AGREE THAT INTER-SECTORAL PRESENTATION CAN BE DROPPED FOR YOUTH.

7. QUESTION 6: WE WISH TO RECONFIRM THE DIRECTIVE.

8. QUESTION 7: WHILE US SUPPORTS LITERACY ACTIVITY, WE BELIEVE IT PREMATURE TO RECOMMEND MAJOR ALLOCATION OF UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 172047

RESOURCES DURING 1975-1980. WE MUST FIRST KNOW IF MEMBER STATES WILLING GIVE IT PRIORITY IN THEIR OWN NATIONAL PLANS IN ORDER DETERMINE IF WORLD COMMUNITY IS READY SUPPLEMENT NATIONAL EFFORTS. EQUALLY IMPORTANT, WE DO NOT BELIEVE MAJOR EFFORT SHOULD BE LAUNCHED UNTIL RESULTS OF EVALUATION OF EXPERIMENTAL FUNCTIONAL LITERACY PROGRAM AVAILABLE AND CAREFULLY STUDIED.

9. QUESTION 8: ANSWER IS YES.

10. QUESTION 9: RESTATE US VIEWS ON THIS, AND ALSO SUPPORT SCANDINAVIAN VIEWS. THERE CAN BE EXCELLENT LINKAGE WITHOUT FULL INTEGRATION.

11. QUESTION 10: WE DID NOT CALL FOR ELIMINATION OF PROGRAM OF PHILOSOPHY WHICH OBVIOUSLY PART OF MANY THINGS UNESCO DOES AND INSEPARABLE THEREFROM. WE MAINTAIN VIEW STAFF IN DIVISION OF PHILOSOPHY CAN BE ELIMINATED WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO PROGRAMS.

12. QUESTION 11: WE DO NOT AGREE WITH CONSOLIDATION OF ACTIVITIES IN FIELDS OF CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION AS SUGGESTED. DOES NOT APPEAR REALISTIC TO PICK OUT PARTS OF SECTORS FOR POSSIBLE JOINT GROUPING. ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER PROBLEMS COULD BE SERIOUS.

13. QUESTION 12: ANSWER IS NEGATIVE AND RESTATE US VIEWS.

14. QUESTION 13: SEE DISCUSSION UNDER QUESTION 2

15. QUESTION 14: ERROR IN NUMBERING. QUESTION DOES NOT EXIST.

16. QUESTION 15: SEE DISCUSSION UNDER QUESTION 2.

17. QUESTION 16: ENTIRE QUESTION APPEARS OVER-SIMPLIFIED. WE DO NOT AGREE THAT PRIORITIES ARE SIGNIFICANT ONLY AT LEVEL OF MEDIUM-TERM OBJECTIVES. LONG-TERM OBJECTIVES MAY NOT BE OF SIMILAR MAJOR POLICY IMPORTANCE AND THUS CAN EQUALLY LEND THEMSELVES TO SOME FORM OF PRIORITY RANKING. IN OTHER WORDS, PRIORITIES ARE SIGNIFICANT AT ALL LEVELS.
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 172047

RE SECOND PART OF QUESTION, RANK ORDER OF PRIORITIES ON BASIS OF CRITERIA IN PARA. 139 MAKES LITTLE SENSE. PRESENT LANGUAGE STANDING ALONE FOR PRIORITY A IS TANTAMOUNT TO SAYING THAT IF UNESCO BELIEVES IT CAN TEACH CHICKENS TO LAY SQUARE EGGS, THEN THAT IS AUTOMATICALLY PRIORITY A ITEM. WE BELIEVE THESE RANKINGS MIGHT READ AS FOLLOWS:

PRIORITY A - MUST MEET ALL OF FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- A) MEDIUM-TERM OBJECTIVE MUST BE OF INTRINSIC IMPORTANCE AND URGENCY,
- B) ONLY UNESCO'S INTERVENTION CAN BRING ABOUT PROGRESS TOWARDS MEDIUM-TERM OBJECTIVE,
- C) UNESCO'S INTERVENTION IS A NECESSARY ELEMENT OR PREREQUISITE TO SUCCESSFUL ACTION BY OTHER ELEMENTS OF UNESCO, OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES OR MEMBER STATES,
- D) UNESCO SHOULD BE IN A POSITION, IN A

RELATIVELY SHORT TIME SPAN, TO MAKE MAJOR
CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS MEDIUM-TERM OBJECTIVE,

E) IRREPARABLE DAMAGE WILL BE DONE IF UNDER-
TAKING IS DELAYED.

PRIORITY B - MUST MEET ALL OF FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- A) SAME AS ABOVE,
- B) UNESCO'S INTERVENTION IS A SIGNIFICANT
CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS PROGRESS IN MEETING
OBJECTIVE,
- C) UNESCO'S INTERVENTION IS A VERY USEFUL
ELEMENT OR DESIRABLE PREREQUISITE TO
SUCCESSFUL ACTION BY OTHER ELEMENTS OF UNESCO,
OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES OR MEMBER STATES,

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 172047

D) SERIOUS DAMAGE WILL BE DONE IF UNDERTAKING
IS DELAYED.

PRIORITY C - MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- A) SAME AS IN OTHER CATEGORIES,
- B) UNESCO'S CONTRIBUTION IS A USEFUL ONE
TOWARDS MEETING OBJECTIVE,
- C) UNESCO INTERVENTION IS OF USE TO OTHER
ELEMENTS OF UNESCO, OTHER INTERNATIONAL
BODIES OR MEMBER STATES IN ACHIEVING
THEIR OBJECTIVES,
- D) INCONVENIENCE COULD RESULT FROM DELAY.

PRIORITY D - MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- A) MEDIUM-TERM OBJECTIVE WOULD BE USEFUL, BUT NOT
INTRINSICALLY URGENT,
- B) UNESCO'S INTERVENTION IS MARGINAL TO
ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF OTHER ENTITIES,
- C) DELAY WOULD CAUSE NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFICULTIES,
- D) OTHERS CAN PERFORM FUNCTION WITH ALMOST
EQUAL EFFECTIVENESS.

18. QUESTION 17: ANSWER IS AFFIRMATIVE.

19. QUESTION 18: PREFER D, BUT WOULD ACCEPT C.

20. QUESTION 19: PREFER APPROACH B BUT SUGGEST BE

UNCLASSIFIED

HEADED "PROJECTION OF RELATIVE LEVELS OF RESOURCE
ALLOCATION" RATHER THAN "GROWTH RATES." WE RECOGNIZE
THAT SUCH PROJECTIONS NECESSARY FOR PLANNING, BUT NOT
PREPARED COMMIT OURSELVES TO ACCEPTANCE SUCH PROJECTIONS
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 172047

IN ADVANCE OF ANY BIENNIAL PLAN. COULD BE, FOR EXAMPLE,
ALLOCATION BECAUSE OF CHANGES AMONG OBJECTIVES, PROGRESS
TOWARDS GOALS, SHIFT IN EMPHASIS, AND QUALITATIVE
IMPROVEMENTS IN PROGRAMMING.

21. QUESTION 20: ADD UNFDAC TO LIST. AGREE THAT SUCH
CAN BE PRESENTED ONLY AT SECTORAL LEVEL AT THIS STAGE.

22. QUESTION 21: AGREE, BUT DO NOT PROPOSE TO SUGGEST
THAT CONSIDERATION OF ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES BE
DROPPED FROM CONSIDERATION FOR 19 C/4. PERHAPS IN 18 C/4
SUCH ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES COULD BE PRESENTED FOR
SEVERAL SELECTED OBJECTIVES ON A TRIAL BASIS.

23. QUESTION 22: AGREE. ROGERS

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 29 AUG 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE172047
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: IO/UNESCO:JCHAAHR:RBALLEN;JU 8-28-73
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730869/abqceikf.tel
Line Count: 247
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN IO
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: PARIS 22213
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: kellerpr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 11 JAN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <11-Jan-2002 by reddocgw>; APPROVED <06 MAR 2002 by kellerpr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: 93RD EXECUTIVE BOARD -- ITEM 5.2 (MEDIUM-TERM OBJECTIVES)
TAGS: AORG, OCON, UNESCO
To: PARIS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005